

### REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled claims 3-5 and amended claim 6 to include the limitations of previous claims 3-5. Claims 1-2 were previously cancelled.

In the aforementioned Office Action, the Examiner objected to Applicant's Amendment of February 13, 2006 under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) "because it includes new matter."

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter was added by the aforementioned Amendment. As stated in the Specification, in original claim 1 and in the Abstract, "the circular disc is provided peripherally thereof with a plurality of blades inserted therein in a mutually spaced and inclined way." As stated on line 7 of page 4 of Applicant's Specification, the flat plates can be welded to. Therefore, it is Applicant's contention that even though the word "slits" was not used, it is abundantly clear that the circular disc includes a plurality of slits as now claimed in amended claim 6.

In the aforementioned Office Action the Examiner also stated "the relationship between a second end of the shank and the lower surface of the disc now claimed in claim 6 is not described in the original filing. Once again, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner. To be more specific on page 4, lines 8-9 the Specification states "a shank 70 of which one end is combined with the center of the surface of the circular disc..." From this, it is clear that the shank does not extend through the disc. Further, amended claim 6 now calls for said shank extending to said circular disc. As defined by Webster's 9<sup>th</sup> New Collegiate Dictionary "to" "2a" into contact esp with the frame used of a door or a window. It is Applicant's contention that this language precludes any interpretation that the shank extends through the disc.

Original claim 6 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Rose (U.S. 1,100,491). It is respectfully submitted that the Rose patent does not disclose or suggest a

stainless steel stirrer as recognized by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn. Further, Rose does not suggest a shank that stops at the circular disc. Even further, the Rose reference relates to a pump and does not disclose or suggest inclined blades at an angle of 40 to 50 degrees from where a radius of the disc intersects with the blade in a counter clockwise direction. Therefore, pursuant to Section 2131 of the MPEP, the reference fails to teach every element of the claim. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.


Original claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. However, since claim 3 has been cancelled this issue is mute.

It is also believed that the other issues raised by the Examiner have been addressed above. Accordingly, since claim 6, the only claim in the Application is now in proper form and clearly distinguished over the cited art prompt favorable action is requested.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP**



DAVID E. DOUGHERTY  
Registration No. 19,576

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
**Date: November 13, 2007**  
**DED/eem**